

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Fig. 6 has been amended to add lead lines that identify the items associated with reference number 224. No new matter has been added (see Fig. 4). An informal copy of revised Fig. 6 shows the proposed corrections in red ink. A formal copy of revised Fig. 6 is also included in the event that the proposed corrections are acceptable.

REMARKS

Consideration of the above-identified application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested. Claims 1-33 are pending in the application. Claim 29 is amended.

Applicants acknowledge the provisional rejection of claims 1-16, 20-21, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for statutory double patenting over co-pending U.S. Application No. 10/320,798. As discussed with Examiner Lee on 12/07/2004, Applicants will address this issue through amendment of the claims in the '798 application or through abandonment of the '798 application upon receipt of the next Official Action for the '798 application. The only basis set forth in the Office Action for rejecting claims 3, 7, and 9-16, 20, 21, and 23-25 is the double patenting rejection. The double patenting rejection being obviated as described above, allowance of claims 3, 7, and 9-16, 20, 21, and 23-25 is requested.

The Office Action does not address claims 17-19 and 22 at all. Allowance of claims 17-19 and 22 is requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 26, 28, and 30-33 were rejected as being anticipated by Chen et al. (US 6,204,458 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Anticipation requires a single prior art reference that discloses each element of the claim. W.L. Gore & Associates v. Garlock, Inc., 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied 469 U.S. 851 (1984). "There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention". Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation

v. Genentech Inc., 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

It is respectfully submitted that Chen et al. does not disclose each and every element of the rejected claims.

Regarding claims 1 and 26, Chen et al. does not disclose first and second contacts including respective connector portions that comprise compliant connectors. The compliant connectors, as defined clearly in the specification, include spaced, deflectable retainer members that have outer surfaces for frictionally engaging an inner side wall of a hole into which the compliant connectors are inserted. Chen et al. clearly does not teach or suggest this structure. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1 and 26 should be withdrawn and claims 1 and 26 should be allowed. Claims 2, 4-6, and 8 depend from claim 1 and should also be allowed as depending from an allowable claim and for the specific features recited therein. Claims 27-33 depend from claim 26 and should also be allowed as depending from an allowable claim and for the specific features recited therein.

Regarding claim 5, Chen et al. does not teach or suggest the second contact including an actuator portion comprising a cam that protrudes from the housing. In Chen et al., the only part of the contacts that protrude from the housing are the connector pins 42 and 50.

Regarding claim 6, Chen et al. does not teach or suggest the cam protruding from a top wall of the housing opposite a bottom wall from which the connector portions protrude. Claim 6 is therefore allowable for this further reason.

Regarding claim 26, Chen et al. also does not teach or suggest first and second contact with respective first and second contact pads constructed of a precious metal alloy. Claim 26 is therefore allowable for this further reason.

Regarding claim 30, Chen et al. does not teach or suggest contact pads capable of switching electrical currents of up to about 14 amperes without arcing. Claim 30 is therefore allowable for this further reason.

Regarding claim 31, Chen et al. does not teach or suggest a first contact pad having a cylindrical configuration with a flat contact surface and a second contact pad having a domed configuration with a domed contact surface. Claim 31 is therefore allowable for this further reason.

Regarding claim 32, Chen et al. does not teach or suggest a domed contact surface providing a wiping action against a flat contact surface. Claim 32 is therefore allowable for this further reason.

Regarding claim 33, Chen et al. does not teach or suggest compliant connector portions of at least one of said first and second contacts comprising a plurality of compliant connector pins. Claim 33 is therefore allowable for this further reason.

In the Office Action, claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. in view of Jost et al. (US 5,963,772). As stated above, however, claim 27 depends from allowable claim 26 and is therefore allowable as depending from an allowable claim.

Claim 29 has been amended to recite the structure of the contacts using means plus function language. This structure is not taught or suggested by the references cited in the Office Action. Claim 29 is therefore allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the above identified application is in condition for allowance, and allowance of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew M. Shaheen

Reg. No. 45,367

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL,  
& TUMMINO L.L.P.  
526 Superior Avenue - Suite 1111  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1400  
Phone: (216) 621-2234  
Fax: (216) 621-4072  
Customer No.: 26294